

X-Sender: pdabbs@doppop2.water.ca.gov
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.2
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2000 13:00:19 -0800
To: Bob Suits <suits@water.ca.gov>
From: Paul Dabbs <pdabbs@water.ca.gov>
Subject: Fwd: State Water Plan Update: Public Comment

Hi Bob:

Here is another public comment for the B160 scoping process - please process and include with other comments received. - Paul.

X-Sender: bennett@rivercity.water.ca.gov
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.0.58
Date: Wed, 02 Feb 2000 09:53:54 -0800
To: Paul Dabbs <pdabbs@water.ca.gov>
From: "William J. Bennett" <bennett@water.ca.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Re: State Water Plan Update: Public Comment

At 10:28 PM 2/1/00 , Felice Pace [felicep@sisqtel.net] wrote:
Input on State Water Plan 2003 Update

To the Director, Ca. DWR:

State law requires the Department of Water Resources (DWR) to update the California Water Plan every five years. The current purpose of the plan is to evaluate how the state's water supply reliability and performance matches up with present and future needs.

The 1998 update provided little more than a highly speculative wish list of expensive and environmentally destructive dam projects located throughout the state, with little or no consideration for conservation and the needs of the ecosystems on which the water supply depends.

The 1998 water plan considered more than 150 new or expanded dam projects throughout the state. Of these, 52 projects are retained for further consideration to meet statewide or local water supply needs. Many of the "retained" and "deferred" projects violate existing state law and/or have been rejected by various state and federal agencies as economically and environmentally infeasible.

The plan retains a proposal to raise the existing Shasta dam on the Sacramento River by more than 100 feet, more than doubling the potential volume of the state's largest reservoir as well as many other large, expensive, inefficient and environmentally destructive

storage schemes.

The California Water Plan must provide for the needs of all Californians in a manner that protects and conserves the beneficial uses of water and other natural resources for Californians alive today and those who will be born in the future. THE PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA UNDERSTAND THAT THESE BENEFITS AND RESOURCES CAN ONLY BE SUSTAINED IF WE ALSO PROTECT AND SUSTAIN THE ECOSYSTEMS ON WHICH THESE RESOURCES DEPEND. ECOSYSTEM PROTECTION SHOULD BE THE TOP PRIORITY FOR THE 2003 UPDATE.

In order to accomplish this we recommend that:

..... DWR eliminate all proposed dam projects that violate existing law, have been rejected by Congress, have been judged not cost effective by regulatory agencies, conflict with existing uses, conflict with current and planned ecosystem and species restoration programs, and would destroy or degrade fish and wildlife habitat.

..... DWR stop wasting its time on proposals that can never be implemented. For example, the proposal to raise Shasta Dam would likely lead to the extinction or extirpation of the Shasta Salamander from federal lands that would be flooded if the dam is raised. This would violate several state and federal laws and would surely be challenged by conservationists.

... the 2003 plan analyze and adopt the water use efficiency, conservation, and reclamation measures proposed in the EWC's blueprint and provide more emphasis on ways to extend the state's existing supplies rather than developing costly and ecologically damaging new storage projects.

. An independent panel of experts should develop new methodologies to estimate current water usage and future water demand to ensure that the 2003 plan does not over-inflate these figures.

. The new plan should have correct figures for current water usage and future water demand, and use methodologies that ensure that future demand is not over-inflated.

. The 2003 plan should propose effective statewide regulation of groundwater to prevent groundwater depletion and adverse environmental and economic impacts. Groundwater analysis should extend to "county of origin" groundwaters and groundwater in all areas that DWR claims have "surplus" water. The effect of removal of so-called "surplus" water from these watersheds on groundwater supplies and levels must be fully studied and disclosed.

. All water development and management proposals must be cost effective and be paid for by those who directly benefit. Neither state nor federal taxpayers should foot the bill to meet local, agriculture and other industrial water supply needs.

Please consider these concepts and this input and keep us informed concerning all meetings and opportunities for input as work on the 2003 Update continues.

Sincerely,

Felice Pace, Coordinator
Klamath River Program

Felice Pace, Coordinator
Klamath River Program
Klamath Forest Alliance
P.O. Box 820
Etna, CA 96027
530-467-5291 (ph and fax), 467-3130 (alternate fax)

"Think WILD Thoughts!"